



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/630,752	08/02/2000	Daniel Baum	1309.003US1	8052
7590 03/11/2009				
Shutterfly, Inc. C/O Xin Wen 2800 Bridge Parkway Redwood City, CA 94065			EXAMINER MISIASZEK, MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT 3625	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/11/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
2
3

4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
5 AND INTERFERENCES
6

7
8 *Ex parte* DANIEL BAUM, AVI BLEIWEISS, and XIN WEN
9

10 Appeal 2009-0169
11 Application 09/630,752
12 Technology Center 3600
13
14

15
16 Decided: ¹March 11, 2009
17

18
19 Before ANTON W. FETTING, DAVID B. WALKER, and JOSEPH A.
20 FISCHETTI, *Administrative Patent Judges*.
21 FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

¹ The two month time period for filing an appeal or commencing a civil action, as recited in 37 CFR § 1.304, begins to run from the decided date shown on this page of the decision. The time period does not run from the Mail Date (paper delivery) or Notification Date (electronic delivery).

DECISION ON APPEAL

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Daniel Baum, Avi Bleiweiss, and Xin Wen (Appellants) seek review under 35 U.S.C. § 134 of a final rejection of claims 1-64, the only claims pending in the application on appeal.

We have jurisdiction over the appeal pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

We REVERSE.

The Appellants invented a system and method for accepting and storing image data from customers and then transferring the image data to a central processing facility for processing and distribution (Specification Page 3, lines 25-27).

An understanding of the invention can be derived from a reading of exemplary claim 1, which is reproduced below [bracketed matter and some paragraphing added].

1. A method of collecting images from a plurality of customers into a kiosk, and transferring images from the kiosk to an image-processing provider, wherein the kiosk includes a computer, a data storage device and an interface for capturing digital images, wherein the data storage device includes computer readable media for storing information representative of the digital images, the method comprising:

[1] accepting image information from a customer into the interface of the kiosk;

[2] accepting user-identifier information into the computer, the user-identifier information corresponding to the customer;

[3] accepting order information into the computer, the order information specifying a service to be provided relative to the image information;

[4] storing into a local storage connected to the computer, a digital representation of the image information and associated user identifier information and order information for each of a plurality of different customers into a data structure;

[5] in response to receipt of a first poll request at the kiosk and upon detecting availability of the data structure, sending data structure address information corresponding to the available data structure from the kiosk to the image processing provider via the communication medium;

[6] in response to receipt of the sent data structure address information at the image-processing provider, sending a data-structure-fetch request across the communications medium from the image-processing provider to the kiosk;

[7] sending the data structure to the image-processing provider via a communications medium, and

[8] storing the data structure in the image-processing provider.

This appeal arises from the Examiner's Final Rejection, mailed July 26, 2005. The Appellants filed an Appeal Brief in support of the appeal on June 6, 2007. An Examiner's Answer to the Appeal Brief was mailed on September 6, 2007.

PRIOR ART

The Examiner relies upon the following prior art:

Rogan et al.	US 5,170,466	Dec. 8, 1992
--------------	--------------	--------------

Frey et al.	US 6,369,908 B1	Apr. 9, 2002
-------------	-----------------	--------------

Ofoto.com Launches Innovative Photo Finishing Service, PR Newswire, December 13, 1999.

REJECTIONS

Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 17, 18-22, 24, 26, 33, 44, 45, 48, 50, and 56-64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Frey, Ofoto, and Rogan.

Claims 34-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Frey and Ofoto.

Claims 4, 6, 7, 10-16, 23, 25, 27-32, 46, 47, 49, and 51-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Frey, Rogan, Ofoto, and Official Notice.

ISSUES

The issues pertinent to this appeal are

- Whether the Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 17, 18-22, 24, 26, 33, 44, 45, 48, 50, and 56-64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Frey, Ofoto, and Rogan.
- Whether the Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 34-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Frey and Rogan.
- Whether the Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 4, 6, 7, 10-16, 23, 25, 27-32, 46, 47, 49, and 51-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Frey, Rogan, Ofoto, and Official Notice.

1 The pertinent issue turns on whether Rogan describes limitation [5] and
2 limitation [6] of claim 1 of the claimed invention.

3 FACTS PERTINENT TO THE ISSUES

4 The following enumerated Findings of Fact (FF) are believed to be supported
5 by a preponderance of the evidence.

6 *Rogan*

7 01. Rogan is directed towards an image and item processing system that
8 has increased efficiency (column 1, lines 53-55).

9 02. Rogan includes a disk controller board that receives an image pack
10 and then prepares that pack for transmittal to the disk drive. Data is then
11 transferred to the specified disk (column 7, lines 26-31).

12 03. Rogan describes the image workstation begins the process of
13 transferring the image by sending a command directing that the storage
14 processor perform a retrieval of the image (column 7, lines 37-50).

15 *Frey*

16 04. Frey is directed towards an interactive photo kiosk for creating,
17 storing and distributing electronic messages (column 2, lines 30-32).

18 05. The kiosk contains a CPU, a payment collection device, a digital
19 camera, and removable electronic storage device (column 2, lines 40-43
20 and column 2, lines 62-64).

- 1 06. The process of capturing an image at the kiosk begins with the user
2 inserting payment into the payment collection device (column 3, lines
3 19-20). The payment collection device can be a credit/debit card reader
4 and the credit/debit card is verified before charges are processed to that
5 card (column 6, lines 9-14).
- 6 07. The user is then provided with the option to store the captured image
7 or email the captured image (column 3, lines 23-25). If the user selects
8 to store the image, the user is further provided with an option of what
9 kind of media to store the image on (column 3, lines 29-30).
- 10 08. The kiosk then captures an image of the user (column 3, lines 43-45).
- 11 09. Once the image is captured, the user has the option to input
12 information, such as text information or audio information, to be
13 associated with the image (column 4, lines 1-4, column 4, lines 33-35,
14 and column 5, lines 1-2).
- 15 10. The CPU connects to the internet at pre-determined times and sends
16 images to their associated email address. The CPU then stores the sent
17 files and email address to a database (column 5, lines 43-52).

18 *Ofoto*

- 19 11. Ofoto is a provider of photo finishing services (Page 1).
- 20 12. Ofoto members are enabled to order photographic prints and have
21 them delivered (Page 2). Customers selected order prints and the orders
22 are processed at Ofoto's processing labs (Page 2).

1 In *Graham*, the Court held that that the obviousness analysis is bottomed on
2 several basic factual inquiries: “[(1)] the scope and content of the prior art are to be
3 determined; [(2)] differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are to be
4 ascertained; and [(3)] the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved.” 383
5 U.S. at 17. See also *KSR Int’l v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. at 1734. “The
6 combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be
7 obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results.” *KSR*, at 1739.

8 “When a work is available in one field of endeavor, design incentives and
9 other market forces can prompt variations of it, either in the same field or a
10 different one. If a person of ordinary skill can implement a predictable variation, §
11 103 likely bars its patentability.” *Id.* at 1740.

12 “For the same reason, if a technique has been used to improve one device,
13 and a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it would improve
14 similar devices in the same way, using the technique is obvious unless its actual
15 application is beyond his or her skill.” *Id.*

16 “Under the correct analysis, any need or problem known in the field of
17 endeavor at the time of invention and addressed by the patent can provide a reason
18 for combining the elements in the manner claimed.” *Id.* at 1742.

19 ANALYSIS

20 *Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 17, 18-22, 24, 26, 33, 44, 45, 48, 50, and 56-64 rejected*
21 *under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Frey, Ofoto, and Rogan*

22 The Appellants argue these claims as a group.

Accordingly, we select claim 1 as representative of the group.
37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii) (2007).

The Examiner found that Frey describes all of the limitations of claim 1 except for limitations [5-8] (Answer Pages 5-7). The Examiner found that Rogan described limitation [5], limitation [6], and limitation [8] and that one of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to combine Frey and Rogan in order to increase the speed of transmitting data by batch processing data during times of low network traffic (Answer Page 6). The Examiner further found that Ofoto describes limitation [7] and one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to combine Frey, Rogan, and Ofoto in order to increase the range of services to include more than just photographic emails (Answer Page 7).

The Appellants contend (1) that none of the references disclose limitation [4] of claim 1 (Br. Page 11), (2) Rogan fails to describe limitation [5], limitation [6], and limitation [8] (Br. Page 13), (3) Frey fails to describe “removing the data structure from the local storage after the data structure has been sent to the image-processing provider” of claim 2 (Br. Page 13), (4) there is no motivation to combine Frey and Rogan (Br. Page 13), (5) Ofoto fails to describe limitation [7] of claim 1 (Br. Page 14), (6) Ofoto fails to describe limitation [5], limitation [6], and limitation [8] (Br. Page 14), and (7) there is no motivation to combine Ofoto to Frey and Rogan (Br. Page 14).

We find that the Appellants’ second argument is determinative. The Appellants contend (2) Rogan fails to describe limitation [5], limitation [6], and limitation [8] (Br. Page 13). We agree with the Appellants. Limitation [5] requires

1 the image processing provider to poll the kiosks to determine if any of the kiosks
2 have data that is available for upload and the kiosk returns the address of the data
3 to the image processing center. That is, the kiosk is polled for a trigger to indicate
4 that a transfer of data should occur. Limitation [6] then requires the image
5 processing center submit a request to transfer the data from the kiosk. Rogan
6 merely describes the transferring of data from one location to another location (FF
7 02) and explicitly describes the transferring of data to begin at the workstation
8 (equivalent to the claimed kiosk), where the workstation sends a command to the
9 storage processor to retrieve the data (FF 03) rather than being polled. Polling is
10 unnecessary because the image workstation controls the process rather than the
11 storage processor. This is in contrast to the polling in the claimed invention. As
12 such, Rogan fails to describe limitation [5] and limitation [6] of the claimed
13 invention, and thus the Examiner failed to establish a prima facie case of
14 obviousness. Because the Appellants' second argument is determinative, we need
15 not reach the remaining arguments.

16 The Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred
17 in rejecting claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 17, 18-22, 24, 26, 33, 44, 45, 48, 50, and 56-64
18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Frey, Rogan, and Ofoto for the
19 above reasons.

20
21
22 *Claims 34-43 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Frey and*
23 *Ofoto*

1 The Appellants argue these claims as a group.

2 Accordingly, we select claim 34 as representative of the group.

3 The Examiner found that Frey describes all of the limitations of claim 34
4 except for “storing the digital images at the second business location, processing
5 prints of the stored images at the second business location, and delivering the
6 processed prints to a customer” (Answer Page 19). The Examiner found that Ofoto
7 describe these limitations and one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it
8 obvious to combine Frey and Ofoto in order to increase the quality of the services
9 provided (Answer Pages 19-20). The Examiner also found that the conditional
10 language preceding the availability of the data structure did not require that the
11 limitations associated to the data structure be read into the claim language (Answer
12 Page 19, footnote referencing Answer Pages 10-11).

13 The Appellants contend that these claims depend from allowable independent
14 claims and are therefore allowable (Br. Page 16). We agree with the Appellants,
15 although their argument has a minor technical flaw, because claim 34 is
16 independent. However, we take the thrust of the Appellants’ argument to be that
17 independent claim 34 recites the “in response to a first poll request at the kiosk”
18 limitation found in limitation [5] and limitation [6] of claim 1. Appellants’
19 arguments regarding these limitations were found to be sufficient to overcome the
20 Appellants’ burden *supra* and are similarly found to be sufficient to overcome the
21 Appellants’ burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 34 and
22 dependant claims 35-43 under U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Frey and
23 Ofoto.

1
2 *Claims 4, 6, 7, 10-16, 23, 25, 27-32, 46, 47, 49, and 51-55 rejected under 35*
3 *U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Frey, Rogan, Ofoto, and Official Notice*

4 The Appellants argue these claims as a group.

5 Accordingly, we select claim 4 as representative of the group.

6 The Examiner found that Frey, Rogan, and Ofoto describe all of the limitations
7 of claim 1, but do not describe the additional limitation of claim 4 of “accepting
8 credit-card payment, and storing into the local storage connected to the computer, a
9 digital representation of the credit-card information” (Answer Page 21). The
10 Examiner took Official Notice that these features were old and well-known in the
11 art and one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify Frey,
12 Rogan, and Ofoto to include these features in order to automate the receipt of
13 payment (Answer Page 21).

14 The Appellants contend that (1) these claims depend from claim 1 and were
15 improperly rejected for the same reasons cited above (Br. Page 17) and (2) there is
16 no motivation to combine Frey, Rogan, Ofoto, and the Examiner’s Official Notice
17 (Br. Page 17).

18 The Appellants contend (1) these claims depend from claim 1 and were
19 improperly rejected for the same reasons cited above (Br. Page 17). We agree with
20 the Appellants. The Appellants rely on their arguments in support of claim 1,
21 which we found to be sufficient to overcome the Appellants’ burden, and so have
22 similarly sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting

claims 4, 6, 7, 10-16, 23, 25, 27-32, 46, 47, 49, and 51-55 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Frey, Rogan, Ofoto, and Official Notice. The Examiner's taking of Official Notice of several features in these claims do not overcome the shortcomings of the references with respect to claim 1, as discussed above.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Appellants have sustained their burden of showing that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 1-64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the prior art.

DECISION

To summarize, our decision is as follows:

- The rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 17, 18-22, 24, 26, 33, 44, 45, 48, 50, and 56-64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Frey, Rogan, and Ofoto is not sustained.
- The rejection of claims 34-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Frey and Ofoto is not sustained.
- The rejection of claims 4, 6, 7, 10-16, 23, 25, 27-32, 46, 47, 49, and 51-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Frey, Rogan, Ofoto, and Official Notice is not sustained.

REVERSED

LV:

SHUTTERFLY, INC.
C/O XIN WEN
2800 BRIDGE PARKWAY
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94065